UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/871,440	05/31/2001	Alok Srivastava	A-012	8891

21253 7590 02/09/2006

CHARLES G. CALL
1161 Marlin Court
Marco Island, FL 34145-5809

EXAMINER	
AVELLINO, JOSEPH E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/871,440	SRIVASTAVA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph E. Avellino	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 December 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 15, and 17 stand independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattis et al. (USPN 6,292,880) (hereinafter Mattis) in view of Graham et al. (USPN 6,594,700) (cited as pertinent art in previous office action) (hereinafter Graham).

3. Referring to claim 1, Mattis discloses a method of responding to an incoming request message (i.e. HTTP GET message) from a sender (i.e. a client) which comprises, in combination, the steps of:

comparing the inbound request message with previously received and stored inbound request messages (e.g. abstract); and

if a match is found between the inbound request message and a given previously stored inbound request message, accessing a stored response (i.e. retrieve the requested object from the cache) previously transmitted in response to the previously

stored inbound message, and returning the stored response to the sender (e.g. abstract; Figure 9C and related portions of the disclosure).

Mattis does not disclose converting the incoming request message into an incoming canonical request message expressed in a predetermined standard form. Graham discloses converting the incoming request message into an incoming canonical request message (the Office takes the term "canonical" to mean "of or pertaining to a standardized form") 412 expressed in a predetermined standard form (Figure 7; col. 9, lines 10-41). Although Graham discloses using the canonical form of the request to determine service discovery, one of ordinary skill in the art would realize the benefits of using the canonical format for the cache lookup of Mattis when taken in view of the secondary reference. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Mattis with Graham since Mattis discloses using a hash function to map duplicate objects that different names but the same format, however does not specifically disclose what this hash function is, leading one of ordinary skill in the art to search for other methods of name/object correlation, eventually finding the novel method of Graham to convert a unique protocol into an XML canonical representation to be utilized with the name server hash function of Mattis.

4. Referring to claim 3, Mattis in view of Schroeder disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Mattis furthermore discloses the step of comparing comprises the substeps of:

generating an access key value based on the content on the inbound canonical request message (Figure 9A, reference character 904; col. 27, line 50 to col. 28, line 3);

accessing zero or more selected ones of said previously received and stored canonical request messages which are specified by said access key value (Figure 9A, reference characters 906-916; col. 28, lines 3-29); and

comparing said incoming canonical request message with said selected ones of said previously received and stored canonical request messages (col. 28, lines 3-30).

5. Referring to claim 4, Mattis in view of Schroeder disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 3. Mattis furthermore discloses wherein when no match is found between said incoming canonical request message and a previously stored canonical request message, performing the step of storing said incoming canonical request message in a first storage location specified by said access key (Figure 10A and related portions of the disclosure).

6. Referring to claim 5, Mattis in view of Schroeder disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 4. Mattis furthermore discloses when no match is found, generating a new response message containing data specified by the incoming request message (i.e. retrieving object from server and storing in cache system) (Figure 9A, reference character 926);

transmitting said new response message to said sender (Figure 9A, reference character 926); and

storing said new response message at a second location associated with said first location (e.g. abstract).

7. Claims 10 and 12-14 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 2, 6-9, 11, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mattis in view of Graham as applied above, and further in view of Schroeder et al. (US 2002/0099735).

8. Referring to claim 2, Mattis in view of Graham discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Mattis in view of Graham does not disclose a portion of the incoming request message is expressed in XML language and is translated into a standard canonical XML form. Schroeder discloses an incoming data object in an XML language and is translated into a standard canonical XML form (p. 4, ¶ 48-49). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mattis and Graham with Schroeder to easily allow disparate systems using different protocols the ability to share information easily without the need for mandated data formats which can be expensive and complicated to intertwine, thereby increasing customer satisfaction and interconnectedness as supported by Schroeder (p. 1, ¶ 4-5).

9. Claims 6-9, 11 and 15-18 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments dated December 26, 2005 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

11. In the remarks, Applicant, argues, in substance, that (1) all the incoming names or URLs arrive under a single protocol HTTP and therefore has no need for a system which serves as a broker between different protocols, therefore there is no motivation to combine Mattis and Graham.

12. As to point (1) Applicant is incorrect. Applicant is invited to view Mattis, col. 8, line 50 where it is stated that the FTP server uses the FTP protocol. Furthermore both Mattis and Graham essentially provide the same service. Both Mattis and Graham receive a request from a client, convert the request into a format with which the system can utilize (in Mattis, the name is hashed to a value; in Graham the request is formatted into an XML canonical representation), they look into a registry to find a matching entity, and then an object is returned to the client when a match is found (Mattis returns the cached object, Graham brokers a communication between the client and the service provider). One of ordinary skill in the art would realize the similarities between the two systems, and would find it obvious to combine the features of Graham to be useful with the system of Mattis. By this rationale, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JEA
January 24, 2006

WILLIAM C. VAUGHN, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER